Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/736,728	RAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.	1647	

All Participants:

(1) *Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.*.

(2) *Kathleen Tyrrell*.

Status of Application: *nonfinal*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *22 December 2004*

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
14, 16 & 18

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

R.C. Hayes

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant agree to amend the first sentence of the specification to indicate priority claimed, by Examiner's amendment. Fixing the typographical error in claim 14, as it relates to the superscript in "A2B5-", was OKd , along with correcting grammar in the last lines of claims 14, 16 & 18 to" [and] so that said glial cells are...".